Seattle Monorail Review Panel
Meeting Notes for August 18, 2003

Panelists	City Staff	SMP Staff & Consultants	Public
Don Royse, Co-Chair	Maureen Colaizzi	Bill Bascus	Howard Anderson
Dan Foltz	Newell Aldrich	Rachel Ben-Shmuel	Cindi Barker
Jack Mackie	Layne Cubell	Jim Gebhard	Richard Borkowski
Cary Moon	Kathy A Dockins	Suanne Pelley	Susan Casey
Vlad Oustimovitch	Scott Dvorak	Karen Langrock	Geof Logan
Nic Rossouw	Kris Effertz	Allen Parker	RG (Skip) Satterwhite
Mimi Sheridan	David Graves	Eric Schmidt	
Blaine Weber	Michelle Leviant	Rick Sundberg (Board)	
	Vince Lyons	Darby Watson	
	Ethan Melone		
	Vanessa Murdock		
	John Rahaim		
	Cheryl Sizov		
	Mary Catherine Snyder		
	John Taylor		

The meeting began with introductions all around.

Business

Approval of Minutes from August 4, 2003

Panel Coordinator Maureen Colaizzi announced that staff hadn't provided 8/4 meeting minutes for the Panel or participants, and would do so via e-mail so they could be approved at the next meeting (September 15, 2003).

Review of Agenda

One item was added to the agenda: the presentation of the SMP video depicting an alignment through Seattle Center. There are actually two versions: one which is 20 seconds long and one which is six minutes long, showing a real-time representation of the Monorail passing through (with two minutes between each train passing). The six-minute piece can be stopped once the Panel gets the gist of it, as there are several two-minute periods with no activity.

Jack Mackie questioned why the Interbay presentation was listed as an "action item" when the Panel hasn't seen any urban design principles or objectives from SMP. The Panel has received principles from Ethan (Melone, SDoT) and from the AIA, but not SMP. The Panel needs to see some guidelines and written objectives before taking action on the design of any segment. At the very least, he will abstain from any action until some guidelines have been presented.

Maureen and Cheryl Sizov responded that they thought the Panel would want to give comments to SMP on the Interbay urban design study being done. The SMP design team work is scheduled to be done by the end of September 2003 and precedes any other design work. Staff is trying to schedule a presentation at that point which would cover all of the goals, principles, and guidelines which result from the analysis of all segments. The Panel's concerns are noted. Jack believes that because the MRP derives from the Design Commission, it should follow (with some hybridization) the DC protocol where the first two reviews thoroughly cover design principles and objectives. Don Royse asked that the Panel finish business and wait until the next agenda item, at which this issue will be discussed anyway. Cheryl added that it is the Panel's choice whether or not to take action. Staff notes items on which they think the Panel

may want to take action, but it is ultimately the Panel's decision. Don deferred the topic until the next agenda item.

Staff Update
Various informational items were distributed to the Panel. Maureen also discussed the development of an MRP Fact Sheet; her intention to collect copies of all previously presented information from SMP; and potential meeting date changes for September. Specifically, there is a conflict with the September 29 meeting date as that is when SMP is having a public hearing on the Draft EIS. There was general consensus among the Panel members that September 22 is the best date for the most people, so the September MRP meetings will be on the 15th and the 22nd from 4:00 to 7:00 pm. The 29th is cancelled.

It was also mentioned that the architect selection process begins Wednesday, August 27. Nic Rossouw will sit on the selection panel for Ballard; Blaine on Downtown and SODO; Vlad on West Seattle.

MRP Review Process and Schedule

Cheryl Sizov, DCLU

The frustration generated by the conversation at the last meeting made it clear that "hindsight is 20/20" and that we need to figure out the best process for MRP reviews. Cheryl handed out a document she created (City/SMP Monorail Project: Conceptual Process and Schedule), and walked the group through it. Panel members noted that the connection between where design review ends and the permitting process begins is critical. Cheryl requests that the Panel spend some time between now and the next meeting discussing whether or not this sequence of review makes sense. If the sequence is correct, she can start working on actual calendar dates. She needs to know if this tool is a good starting point to determine actual dates.

The other handout (Seattle Monorail Review Panel Project Review Responsibilities) is a road map for Panel purview. It includes three primary topic areas (Planning, Design, and Process) with specific items in each area, and lists the lead reviewer for each and to whom that group is advisory. The purpose of this document is to answer earlier questions about the Panel's scope. There will be no lack of work for the Panel; they will need to make choices about how they want to prioritize their time. Although the Planning Commission is studying the EIS, the Panel and staff still want a presentation regarding the alignment in order to inform Council, so they in turn can make their decision.

There are two other charts "in the works":

1) a document comparing the MRP process with those of the Design Commission, the Design Review Boards, and the Light Rail Review Panel (which was the initial model for MRP). MRP will actually be somewhat different from all of these, including LRRP. We need to tailor the process to fit this particular project.
2) a document showing how design work originates from guidelines and continues through the design and design review process (through the Panel, public, Council, internal SMP review, MUP process, etc). It will describe the relationship as well as explain how the various acronyms (DBOM, DDR, etc) fit into that relationship (between scope, sequence, schedule, and priorities). We want your feedback on how they all work together.

Discussion

- First of all, I want to give a big thanks to Cheryl! Distilling this into a single-page view of the process is essential. One suggestion I have: there seems to be a big gap for the MRP in 3rd/4th Quarter of 2004, which probably won't exist. Regardless of the rigidity of the RFP, there will be departures, etc, which will require review. That might be a good time to solidify those details with the contractor; they won't be as flexible AFTER they're selected as they will be BEFORE.
- The "Additional Review as Needed" in 2nd Quarter 2004 has an ambiguous ending, so maybe that will stretch out to 3rd & 4th Quarters.
- This is exactly what we needed. Council decision points would be helpful as well, so the MRP can coordinate its review with their decisions. Also, shouldn't the alignment decision be before the station design? Or at least more tied to them? We need something in the unified guidelines which includes the alignment, the relationship of the guideway to the street, public faces around the stations, what will happen at the stations (besides people getting on and off trains), how the system will be viewed from the streets: the entire urban perspective. I'm counting on that to be a substantial part of the discussion from which everything else will flow more effectively.
- This is a great first start. This project is so complex, it will take time to make the schedule completely thorough; I will need time to look through it in order to make appropriate comments, too. Great point, Cary (the need to be thorough). Was this schedule done with SMP's help? And what about conceptual design and MUP submittal? *MUP submittal dates would be bracketed by the Panel's first and second reviews. Dravus & Mercer are being used as examples to test the process. The concept design and DDR "bubbles" on the chart appear earlier because of those two stations start earlier.*
- I believe there are fewer alignment questions on those two stations, which is why they can be used as examples.
- The guideway design development is shown after the selection of the contractor, so what level of design goes into the DBOM contract? I don't want us to lose sight of guideway design, especially since we'll be seeing only preliminary things before the contract is awarded (cites example from Vancouver). *Tom Horkan is here to talk about that.*
- The alignment decision by the board is after the FEIS. We may need to re-review if there are any changes, since station locations won't be final until that point. Some of these stations may reappear after we've seen them.
- I appreciate the global view all in one place. I think the next step is to set up a critical path; we almost need to work backward (to get the sequence right). We're "marrying up" different processes here. First, we need design criteria to establish urban design guidelines; second, we need schematic (concept) design, design development; third, we need construction documents. The finished product must relate back to the initial design criteria. We should use something like Microsoft Project to create a critical path schedule and establish **"**brightlines**"** and specific deadlines. Timely feedback from the Panel (to staff) will be very important, relating not only to the schedule but to what is the most crucial element. *This should lead to priority-setting.*
- SMP should do that in coordination with the City. The list for determining the critical path will be huge, but I don't necessarily agree that Microsoft Project would be a good tool to use for the schedule.
- I think the collaborative work idea is a good suggestion. This is a great start.
- I'm looking at Nick (Licata)'s 8/7 letter to us regarding Council discussion in October on preferred alignment and station locations. That's coming up very soon. Communication with staff and Council is part of the critical path. *We had a productive meeting with Council staff (to discuss) when they will need our help. We're aiming for an alignment presentation to come to the Panel in September.*

- The calendar calls for having a September Council subcommittee meeting on the Seattle Center transfer agreement. There do seem to be some major issues in the EIS that are relevant to that, and the FEIS won't be out until next year.
- We should note all options on the table so we can comment on all of them.
- Regarding the smaller document (MRP Project Review Responsibilities), it says the Panel can elect to receive the station area planning (SAP) presentations. It seems to me that it's critical we get the City's take on what's likely to happen with the SAP work that goes beyond the station presentations. I know we're not looking for more things to add to the schedule, but it seems like those are totally critical.
- If there are no other comments I'd like to close discussion by adding my thanks to those of the other Panel members. I think we're ready for SMP's presentation.

SMP Schedule and DBOM Process

Rachel Ben-Shmuel, SMP
Tom Horkan, SMP

Rachel Ben Shmuel reported that she had received e-mails from Panel members (compiled by Maureen and Cheryl) expressing various concerns about the project schedule and presentations to MRP. She is looking them over and working on a response she hopes will allay the Panel's concerns. She also has architect selection packets which she will give to Vlad Oustimovitch, Nic Rossouw, and Blaine Weber so they have them well before the meeting.

DBOM Process

Tom Horkan, Director of Design and Construction for the Monorail, introduced himself as this is his first meeting. He looks forward to working with the Panel, and wants to address any concerns (specifically about the DBOM process and how they intend to ensure design quality) and work collectively on the project. He'd also like to talk about where we are in the process and where we're going in the future. He presented a Power Point show on the DBOM Process, of which he has hard copies for the Panel for future reference. Italicized text represents Tom's comments accompanying the text in the slides.

The presentation began with the three questions which seem to be the MRP's primary concerns:

1) How will SMP's commitment to design excellence be carried out by a DBOM contractor? *This is something SMP staff is concerned about as well. A great deal of final design control is given over to a consortium of designers, contractors, and train system suppliers. This is discussed in slides 7 & 8.*
2) How will the MRP's input be meaningful in this type of "fast track" process? *We've been up front about the fact that we're moving very quickly on this, and that's because we're trying to meet the promise that was given to the citizens of Seattle when they voted to get an initial segment up and running by December 2007. We're also moving quickly because it's a smart thing to do financially. This is a long-term project, and the longer a project stretches out, the more some uncertainty increases on the point of the contractor that he'll be able to keep to his fixed price. We also need to move prudently so City and public concerns are properly dealt with.*
3) How will the MRP have an impact on final design? *MRP input will definitely have an impact on the final design of the project.*

The second slide outlined SMP's project goals, with Tom noting that these goals can sometimes seem to be in conflict with each other. It's important that we meet all these goals, and that's a difficult balancing act, but a challenge we've accepted.

The third slide gave a brief description of Green Line Procurement. Many options were discussed initially. After the election the SMP board did a thorough review and directed staff to pursue DBOM in order to best achieve all the goals listed above.

The fourth slide gave an overview of DBOM. DBOM also brings in system supply and train supply. The primary advantage is very early cost certainty in the overall project implementation. The designer works with the contractor and has a full design team including landscape architects, urban designers, engineers, architects, etc. – all the elements needed for a project to be successfully implemented. The whole entity accepts design risk and construction liability. If they're wrong (I'll go over those possibilities later), they have the responsibility to fix it.

The fifth and sixth slides presented what DBOM means for the Green Line. The ability to accelerate the schedule through the use of DBOM has been proven many times throughout the country – both design and final completion. With a bond-financed project such as this, it's important we can say at some point, "This (the fixed price) is what the Monorail will cost." There will always be some uncertainty, but knowing with some degree of what the final cost will be is a huge advantage. Allocating risk is a commercial balancing act that we go through as we prepare the RFP, and that may change as we go through time, understanding what the cost of some of that risk allocation might be. With the long-term relationship, DBOM contracts that are successful and still in the industry have done very well, learning what the customer's values are, instead of coming in, building a project, and leaving.

The seventh and eighth slides addressed how SMP would be able to assure design excellence. We made an early decision not to turn over the MUP process responsibility to the contractor, where you'd have a design-build process driven by the financial bottom line. We're going beyond the MUP process by developing DDRs. There are other aesthetic elements of stations we'll want to specify, making those a requirement the contractor has to adhere to. We'll be spending a lot of time over the next year dealing with how to detail those DDRs. That's why we're doing so much analysis now (plan survey, geotechnical borings, etc), so we'll draw a very tight envelope of what flexibility the contractor has to build the guideway. The MUP process and DDRs get to the heart of design – that's our goal. Approval conditions will be conditions of the contract, and things like the vehicle systems and vehicle power supplies will be specifications given to the DBOM contractor in the RFP. SMP won't be leaving, so will hold contractor to the design included in the RFP. The contractor's main incentive will be to do it right. Their incentive is to make money while building the project as fast as they can. The art is being able to write your specifications in a detailed way.

The ninth slide explained the structure of the DBOM team, the tenth slide covered the allocation of project risk, the eleventh slide gave a brief description of the DBOM procurement process, the twelfth slide covered the development of the RFP (Request for Proposal), and the thirteenth and final slide gave the current RFP status.

Discussion

- I really appreciate this presentation; it was really useful. It's good to have a decision-maker here at the meetings. *In the future, Jim and Tom will be coming too.*
- Do you have any examples of transportation systems constructed like this (DBOM)? *Las Vegas ('s Monorail) was DBOM, but that was a public/private venture so it's a bit different. I know our process and values are different (from Vegas). New Jersey has two (that are DBOM) and the Pasadena Gold Line began with DBOM but started over with Design-Build.*
- I'd like to start off by saying "welcome!" to Jim. The way this process has been described, it actually sounds like a classic DB or a modified DBOM. It's more like a Design Assist. As part of a team, the contractors own the design; the contractor is pricing through the process.

But this is being designed by an architect or architects who aren't part of the DBOM team per se. It's not until after the design is "blessed" that the contractor takes the mantle. They're inheriting it, so where's their ownership in the design? *This is more like a public sector project. Where the station is, how it functions, the structural side – is done by the DBOM contractor. We'll be reviewing drawings with the Panel and will package those for the DBOM contractor.*

- I am confused. In a conventional process, the architect is the agent for the owner and ensures that the design intent is carried out. So who is the agent in this case? How does it work contractually? Regarding design excellence, once the construction starts and budget issues arise and value engineering starts, who will be looking out for the City and the public to ensure there's no diminution of design quality? *It's our intent to get a fixed price up front. The answer is probably "no" if they want to change the design to save money, because at that point it's been through the MRP, it's been through City review, there's been public input. The answer would be no.*
- Let's say you get two bids back: one at $1.9B and one at $2.1B. The $1.9B bid says, we can bring it down, but this is what we'll have to do. You've got two things going on right now that could negatively impact the Monorail, like the low dollar and world economies (Japan & Canada being the two options for the Monorail itself), and the revenue shortfall. It's a realistic scenario. Light Rail had to become a shorter system to accommodate these issues. *We don't have that option. We need to go back through the process if that happens. There is no other answer. We'll be having lots of questions about what people want in this project and whether or not we can afford those things.*
- In the past two or three weeks I've read three times that SMP has publicly stated they would cut design and environmental mitigation if cuts had to be made. *I haven't heard that!* You don't have to respond directly to that as you weren't the one who was quoted, but my question is this: what is the City's role/review function toward the end? When will the columns and guideways be designed? Fourth quarter of next year? *Yes.* And construction starts the next quarter. There's not much time left for design between awarding the DBOM contract and the beginning of construction. *Preliminary Engineering is starting certain elements of the guideway at risk. We want to take the design to a level that can be completed and we can draw that envelope I was talking about earlier. When the contract is awarded, we will take it through final design. At this point, Ethan noted he would also like to address that. There have been some questions about the City's role. It's a matter of quality assurance and quality control. The owner and the City each have a role. They refer to different sources of authority and different ways of enforcing that in that role, e.g. Sound Transit had its own quality assurance program and the City has inspectors as well. The owner relies on the contractor's requirements; the City relies on permitting and codes. To the extent that design guidelines come from this process and are made into a formal, regulatory document (e.g. a Director's Rule or through Council adoption), that will be another source of authority, another element in our role of quality assurance and control. Now we need to figure out how to integrate those different roles of quality assurance and control.*
- That should go on our list.
- Ethan used Sound Transit as a model. LRRP followed design from concept to final design, and into construction documents, reviewing and recommending approval (or disapproval) of design. Is that the model we'll see here? *Probably not. I don't think it's an applicable model because there are 19 stations, a guideway, and the process is DBOM. The process should be tailored to the project. I don't think there's any disagreement about having the quality assurance and control, it just needs to be tailored to this project. I'll have some materials to support that at the next meeting.*
- In the handout we received at the 8/4 meeting: Meeting our Goal of Design Excellence, I'm looking at number 5: " The DBOM Contract: SMP negotiates contract, SMP assures DBOM

contractor follows design direction, SMP provides oversight and contract, etc." Where is the City and MRP in that? We're charged to review the final design. Things are going to change, and we'll need to see those changes. You need to bring something that assures that. *We're still working on it. We have opportunities to do things with this process that we couldn't or didn't with LRRP.*

- Tom, you mentioned the advantages and challenges with DBOM; could we also see the disadvantages? *The challenges are the disadvantages. Quality assurance is more compressed with this time issue. But you have to balance the advantages and disadvantages. The advantages are a fixed price, the long-term relationship, and a faster schedule.*
- There is some space between the public RFP addendum and contractor selection. What happens there? *The MUP applications are staggered to implement the stations: first the prototypical stations and then the packaged stations. Rachel will discuss that later. I'd propose additional station review. On the construction side, answering questions from the contractor. Then a very robust evaluation.* So that's where any "hiccup" would happen? *We've been talking about how to deal with those problems if and when they arise. SMP wants to deliver the process on time.*
- There are potential disadvantages: you send it out and it's out of your hands (taking place in Tokyo or Montreal); because you are not involved in the process you won't know if they're on target until they come in. *I've seen that happen with all types of processes.*
- You will have architects who are enthusiastic about doing good design, and we've all seen the pretty pictures of how it will look, like the Calatrava-esque shots, but how do you reconcile the public thinking they've already got a design with the contractor giving you the hard bid sometime after that? *The hard-bid for the stations for which we've already developed DDRs will be in July.* But the public will be seeing things this fall. What if the bid comes in too high? *Anytime that happens you have to revisit (the design).* Why do you prefer not having the contractor on board at the time of design? Why not avoid a surprise? *Because the other option is to stop and say we're not going to do stations right now, and have the contractor take the public through the design process (after the contract has been awarded). There are disadvantages to that, too. It will take much longer for the project to be completed. The risk of waiting is too great.*
- The guideway has DDRs, correct? *Yes.* And the DDRs will be part of the RFP? *Yes, for the elements done before the RFP, and there will be and addendum to the RFP incorporating more stations later. Also, there may be some prior to the notice to proceed that we issue & negotiate directly with the selected contractor. I'll be discussing that in my presentation.*
- It's crucial that you make sure the DDRs are clear so the incoming bids are realistic.
- I think the Panel needs to consider something: we are on a very regular schedule, meeting twice per month. SMP's schedule is very fast. I think we should consider meeting once a week for the next six months and then take six months off or meet once a month for the rest of the project. Please think that over while Rachel is talking.

SMP Schedule

Rachel Ben-Shmuel distributed another handout representing the SMP schedule and explained the legend at the bottom. The earliest phase the schedule is review done by the MRP; the second stage is MUP submittal; the third stage is review by MRP while the item in question is in the MUP process. The order of review is as follows: Mercer and Dravus, Operations Center, Packages 2a through 2c (to be reviewed separately), and Packages 3a through 3c (also to be reviewed separately). She points out that no stations have yet been attached to the six packages; they will be when MRP sees the next iteration of the schedule. Each package will have the indicated number of associated stations. Rachel agrees with Cary suggested that looking at multiple stations in one meeting would be very hard, which is why SMP relies on MRP's recommendations.

Rachel clarifies that Mercer and Dravus are examples. Concept Design review is scheduled for the September 15 meeting. SMP knows they need to get design guidelines to MRP prior to that; if they are not ready by the 15th, Mercer and Dravus won't be presented at that time. The Design Review Program sets a good example: the review is from broad to specific.

SMP wants Panel advice in order to prepare their MUP applications. The Mercer/Dravus MUP applications will be completed at the end of September. 30 to 45 days later the DCLU corrections will be received. SMP wants Panel comments after that as well. SMP will also develop the DDRs, so the second time you see a station, the Panel will be commenting on both the station design and the DDRs, and whether the things in there are what they want to see. There will be more time to discuss the design the second time around, and the MRP advice will be incorporated into the RFP and the first addendum, so the contractor will have the benefit of MRP advice on as much as possible early on. The Operations Center will come in shortly after Mercer and Dravus, and will have more review time than the other elements due to its size and complexity.

Cheryl asked for clarification with the legend: the red squares and green circles represent MRP and SMP review; the blue diamonds is MUP submittal. Rachel asked if the schedule was clear enough or if the Panel wanted her to go through the whole thing. They felt it was clear and were ready to begin asking questions.

Discussion

- Will there be two months or more between first and second review so if we don't recommend approval you'll have time to revisit it? *Yes. There will be the opportunity for us to take your comments and work with them through the MUP process. We'll know how it works a lot better after the first two stations.*
- Where is the operations center located? *At the former Northwest Center for the Retarded site, just north of the Magnolia Bridge.*
- The review of Mercer and Dravus might work, but the downtown stations might need more thorough review (more meetings). *Or longer sessions if you're seeing five or six stations at a time*.
- Five or six stations at a time would be impossible, even if the sessions were longer.
- I agree with Cary about meeting weekly. From a Design Review Program perspective, sometimes we have three meetings (for one project), so meeting more often seems valid. We probably wouldn't want to see more than two stations per meeting. All of these stations are specific buildings in specific neighborhoods and there will be a lot of people who will want to show up for that. *I know what it's like in Design Review where the public comes and they want to talk, because that is their only opportunity to talk; this won't be like that. We have representatives up and down the alignment. We're already meeting with some community groups, and we also want to bring design to regular community meetings. In addition, we're launching the Monorail Design Studio in our offices, and we'll let the public know where the decision points are (both MRP and MUP).*
- That's a good idea, but I don't know how that information will get to the Panel.
- I appreciate the schedule despite its roughness. I'm concerned that the stations will begin to look the same. With this set-up, we're looking at 19 stations and the Operations Center. Where is the review of the bridges, water crossings, parking, substations, and the corridor itself? Look to what Sound Transit went through with MLK. *Bridges are considered part of the guideway; they will go in for MUP because they both have shoreline approaches. They will go through the process of community involvement and come before the MRP. You will see them on the schedule later. Many of the substations will be incorporated into the stations,*

but you should take a look at those that aren't. We're working on the DDRs and schedule for the guideway/corridor.

- The guideway and the corridor aren't the same thing. The corridor follows the guideway but also goes off to its left and right. *City staff noted that their suggestion is to look at it by corridor, by segment, and how the guideway fits into the design of the whole street, street function, streetscape – all those things. If those can be incorporated into what Rachel describes as a context presentation, it's more than just what a DRB context presentation would be. It's not just a nine-block area; it's a product of the area-specific urban design studies that SMP has been doing. This is our take on it: that context presentation should start by segment and go to station area and have street design through the corridor, everything you're describing. That would be the kind of context you'd probably want to have for reviewing the stations. Ultimately, the DDRs and design criteria for those elements are as important, if not more important, than those for the stations themselves. We'd suggest that it inform the design review of both the stations and the corridor, then we'd have to look at the matches between that and the schedule.*
- I need a definition of what is affordable and what is not. The additional reviews, and what we see in the drawings, is all that fitting in the SMP budget? *Bear in mind that Rachel's schedule focuses on stations and MUPs, but ours has that and more. It hasn't been overlooked. We can discuss that ourselves.*
- We need a detailed schedule when looking at this. *We hope to have something better for you next time.*
- It seems like a series of stations might inform corridor analysis, which might work more into this than just review of stations.
- Another way to look at it would be stations by type.
- Your first step is "concept design" – what is that? We need to see good site analysis of urban patterns, context, pedestrian and vehicular movement, pedestrian movement . . . we don't want unsubstantiated "pretty pictures." We want something site-specific with the recognition that each station represents a major change to the public realm and the opportunity to create something special. In the Design Review Program, we talk about these issues <u>before</u> we see the pretty pictures. Maybe extra meetings would be best so there's no "back to square one" if we're off target.
- That was stated in the letter to Rachel and the rest of the SMP staff, and I agree. It's critical. It would be great if those could be added. It's what makes us able to review design well, and actually give guidance.
- I'd like the Panel to agree with me that this schedule is fine but with one thing as a deal-breaker: there will be no review of Mercer or Dravus until we have seen some urban design guidelines. There's plenty of time to do it.
- But maybe reviewing concept or site design will help us help them to develop criteria and urban design guidelines. I'm not entirely against having presentations early on in order to help us develop those.
- I support Cary. I think we need to start with at least some preliminary guidelines.
- I'm just talking about big picture things here, larger urban design issues. We've gotten promises, but no commitments. We need something besides SMP's goals.
- Until we saw some urban design studies earlier and I saw renderings of the guideway arching over the street versus the other way, I hadn't thought about how it could look; seeing something made me think about that. After seeing it I could think about whether we want to minimize the impact of the guideway or make it a great part of the street. If we have grand statements beforehand it may stifle us later on.
- Yes, I think it's a good way to start. Do we have some level of agreement?
- I disagree. I think a parallel process is beneficial.
- Maybe we define it as "parallel" with a preliminary presentation.
- I support Cary. I want to get the process started.

Action

The Panel recommends that prior to conducting an initial review of Mercer and Dravus stations, that they request the opportunity to review larger scale urban design guidelines and possibly the alignment, including guideway and spaces underneath the guideway, the relationship to the street, public spaces at the station (hinting at programs that might happen at stations besides boarding and entering), and other issues that staff will work out with SMP. The Panel will do so with the understanding that there may be future revisions or adjustments to said guidelines.

The action was passed unanimously with no abstentions by the Panel (moved by Cary and seconded by Jack).

Seattle Center Video Simulations

Before SMP's presentation of the Interbay segment, the Panel will see the video simulations referred to in the Business portion of the agenda. Suanne Pelley described the simulations prior to showing them. They depict the view from just south of the International Fountain of the Monorail crossing the Seattle Center campus. SMP chose to have the train stop where the pedestrian viewpoint ends. Cary asked if these videos showed emergency egress features; they do not. The Panel watched the first (shorter) version of the video and about half of the second; they had the following questions:

Discussion

- The sound – is that what it should sound like? *Yes.*
- The columns are invisible. (In the video, no columns were visible; all were behind trees).
- How fast does it travel? *30mph, which means the train is in view for about ten seconds.*
- Do you have any shots at night? *No, we shot our live footage during the daytime. For your reference, this depicts peak time. During non-peak times, trains will run every eight minutes (not four), so there would be four-minute periods with no train passing.*
- What about during events? *We presume the train would be running on the peak hour schedule during events. And yes, the columns are all behind trees in this video. I'll have to ask about that.*
- I think we got the picture. *We'll also be at Bumbershoot with this.*

Interbay Segment Urban Design Study

Eric Schmidt, Cascade Design Collaborative

Eric brought about 12 representations here, showing different pieces of the contents of the Interbay Area. He planned to go over them quickly but assured the Panel he could go back to any of the drawings if necessary.

We are showing overall context and land use issues, and where the stations are located. There are street sections showing the guideway structure and where it might be located in terms of that section. Then there are plan views showing how the columns are laid out in the street for the three different segments, with station locations and options for Dravus station so you can see the context between stations.

Mercer and Dravus stations are prototypes, so they're always shown in the drawings. The future Howe station sometimes shows up in there, as it is a critical station in the Interbay Station. It's a critical part because the guideway engineers will need to find a flat spot for the guideway to get over the existing Magnolia Bridge conditions, whether it's built now or in the future. The station may end up moving a couple of hundred feet up or down from the actual Howe Street

crossing. It will depend what sort of flexibility they have with the Magnolia Bridge, the switching stations, and the planning going on down there. Having columns spaced equidistantly between the stations is always better, but there will be flexibility in that location (to accommodate Howe). Mercer and Dravus are the main two elements featured here, but Howe is the third element. Because so much is going on there, it allows us to study the implications of the center alignment versus the implications of a west-side alignment.

In this Interbay development study, the different colors represent different bike usage. We've included bike trails and bike lanes (as well as potential bike trails). We've also got current bike usage that doesn't have striped bike lanes. We're looking at bike usage and connections, because Dravus could be very bike-oriented. Folks could bike there, park, and visit the Locks. We want to see how best to fill the need and think about bike storage that could be at the station to build bike connectivity to the station. We've been working with Place Architects (the bike sub-consultants) on this.

Here are the three stations within the context of Interbay. The guideway shown here is typical with the north- and south-bound right-of-way, plus cars and trucks. Our biggest concerns are the pedestrian environment, the size of the sidewalk, parking opportunities between columns, alley access out to the street, the setback requirements for the cone of vision as you come out to the street. Will we have to widen the right-of-way or move the opposite side curve?

Working back from the end with column location, we chose to look at the "most important" driveways. Then we looked at column location, and how much flexibility we would have with relation to that. With some, there's 60 to 70 feet of flexibility. We're working with guideway designers on this. They will let us know how much flexibility is needed at each column. We provide them with requirements for street safety, driveway access, pedestrian needs, and property line setback and works on the guideway from a systems point of view. For example, there aren't many driveways on the section of Dravus to 16th, so the flexibility (of column location) is much greater. On 15th in Ballard, it's much smaller because there are so many small, individually-owned parcels and each has its own driveway and parking.

The prototypical section on 15th shows the guideway on west side of the street. The different configurations would either allow or not allow parking on side of the street depending on which dimensions we'd want to pick up. We can lose the parking if the dimension of the travel lane is made smaller. We can have wide travel dimension with no parking, or narrow travel dimension and a parking lane. We need to know what the trade-offs are.

One of the few segments in the entire 14-mile alignment where the speed limit gets to 40 mph is in Interbay. Because of that, it requires some WSDoT control regarding safety and access/egress off of side driveways. The columns need to be 15' from the travel lanes unless there's a jersey barrier between the column and the sidewalk. There are three ways to solve the problem: use the barrier, change the speed, or move column from symmetrical to asymmetrical to avoid the need for a barrier. We will look at all of them and determine the best solution. In this drawing we're showing the asymmetrical option (of the guideway) as well. The design is still going through weekly iterations.

This overview shows columns outside the existing curve at the standard 110' intervals with about 50' of flexibility at each. It gives us a look at lane configuration, turning movement options, traffic capacity we'll study when the EIS comes out, and greater flexibility with access onto those side properties, and left turns onto the road. With the center alignment we're looking at the same things, as well as lighting options and making sure enough light makes it to the street. The center alignment option has less flexibility. The median is fixed so the column head has to

shift slightly east or west about every 100' to maintain a smooth ride. We're also looking at u-turn possibilities because the median limits u-turns today.

In the Harrison section (between Elliott and the Arena), we've lost three parking spaces. The street slope may result in a guideway height ranging from 20' at one end (preferred) to 40' at the other. We are trying to get it as low as possible. There isn't as much flexibility with column spacing at Harrison as there is with 15th and/or Elliott. If the guideway design team needs more flexibility, we can remove more parking spaces or restrict right- and left-hand turns out of alleys. This is probably our tightest configuration of the segment.

Discussion

- With regard to that last drawing, on the bus tour the Panel took, Joel Horn said that building at the corner of Harrison and Queen Anne Avenue North would be demolished. *Yes.* Then why is it in the picture? [Allen Parker, SMP] *It isn't currently slated for demolition, but because we haven't yet confirmed the station location at Seattle Center, we couldn't represent that in the drawings. This will not be confirmed until further in the process.*
- If we're seeing the segments and the stations only twice, and the materials include incomplete or conflicting information, the process isn't going to work. *We'll have that kind of information ironed out before the end of September.*
- I appreciate that, but we're going to get a first crack at something and then a second, and if there's a substantial lack of information we can't make an informed decision.
- We hope all involved will work to minimize that happening.
- We've had the advantage of seeing a few urban design presentations before yours, and I'm trying to think of some of the high points of theirs that you should think about before your next presentation. You were really thorough about showing bikes, parking, traffic, the relationship to the buildings, but what we need to see are experiential things: what kind of views will the rider have; what kind of views are important; from Queen Anne or Magnolia, what will be seen of the guideway, and what advice will you give to the design team about that issue. How you'll deal with the slope and the relationship to the hill—the neighborhood character information. *We have that; we were limited to technical drawings because of time.*
- Where is the Ballard Bridge touchdown? *I don't have that on drawings because it is not part of our contract. We're not working on that section so I don't have the exact location where the superstructure goes from the guideway to the bridge. I do know it will change from a single-column structure to a bridge structure.*
- What's the height at Dravus (Station)? *28' to 40'. We don't have a lot of topography to deal with there.*
- Could you provide the information you mentioned to the Panel some other way? *(It's determined those requests will go from MRP staff to Rachel, who will provide Maureen with the requested information).*
- What scope of work do you have that is relative to previous presentations we've seen? This is very different. Do we need presentation criteria for more consistency to help with our evaluation? *Do you mean consistency of the work scope itself or of the graphic presentation?* For example, will the work scope this segment be the same as 5th Avenue? *Basically the scopes are the same. We started by looking at what the critical land use features are. Visualization is the next step. We took the opposite approach from the other teams (because of the nature of Interbay). How do we deal with this at the micro level? We will start to look more at technical analysis and we will move toward visualizations.*
- I think Cary's comment is pertinent. What other presentations had was the pedestrian context (like elevations). I'd like consistency and continuity at some point.
- A CD or handouts may not be as good as an actual presentation for those experiential things. Downtown doesn't have a golf course or a p-patch. *Yes, you can see why those*

doing the downtown segment start with detailed issues (buildings, windows at guideway level, etc) and we started from the other direction.

- This definitely needs to be presented to the Panel – no CDs or drawings.
- How high does the guideway have to be to get over the Magnolia Bridge? How high will Howe station be? How high are the switches, how many are there, and how big are they? *The (Howe) station type and where it's located will determine the switches and their transitions..*
- Where in the urban design analysis do you address the switchyard? The maintenance base? *That's not in the consultants' scope.*
- That piece has to be looked at from an urban design standpoint because that parcel is primed for change. *We're being more driven by technical demands than urban design issues because of what's there today. There's more flexibility with an urban design "response" as opposed to a technical "demand."*
- This drawing in particular illustrates the importance of Station Area Planning and talking with City staff working on the bridge, and the Port. We know there are a lot of major infrastructure changes coming.
- I would like a broad topographic map of this as well. People will be seeing it from above so it needs to fit into a broader frame. That's why I want to know how high those beams are going to be.
- That's quite a slope from Harrison to Elliott; how high does it have to be at Elliott to accommodate the slope? Nothing precise, but what's the range? *22' on the underside of the column at the Arena; depending on the Arena Station it could be a little higher.*
- The building on that corner is 40'. *NBBJ is looking at lots of options; one is the guideway going over the building. It's a question of chasing the slope.*
- The alignment will have to be as high as needed for any of the Magnolia Bridge options. *For the existing ones or any of the ones here (refers to four options).*
- Unfortunately, you push the rail pretty high up at switching yards. *We don't have a lot of input back from the technical side on that. We're not working on the maintenance base.*
- If Panel discussion is finished, I'd like to hear some public comment.

Public Comment

- I live at 14th and Dravus, so I will be looking at the 16th & Dravus Station. I also garden at the p-patch. If the guideway is on the west side of the street, it will be right on top of us. The Interbay Gardeners would like a meeting with SMP staff but as yet have been unable to get one. We'd also like to talk about where the maintenance facilities are going to be. How will we get out to the Interbay p-patch? What about the QFC? Where are people going to park when they come to that station? There are a lot of unanswered questions.
- I'm concerned about SMP's "need for speed." I'm familiar with construction litigation and I think we're all aware that proceeding too fast can be just as costly as too slow. I think this project is pushing the Panel. I urge the Panel to stick to what IT needs, and not accommodate SMP's schedule. In the end, you'll see you're serving the public's needs in the best way. Panel, stick to your guns!
- From what I can see, it looks like you're going from 0% design to 100% design by next summer? I do project management and a year seems impossible. I concur with Geof, and urge the Panel to be thorough and insist on excellent design. I'm also concerned about the 45-day review period for the EIS. It's unacceptable. This is a $2B project. I-90 had a 90-day review period and it was a $70M project; they took a year or two putting the EIS together. I urge that the review period be changed.

Maureen asked that any members of the public who have not signed up on the sign-in sheet to please do so, so they can be added to our e-mail list and receive minutes of this meeting in addition to information about future meetings.

Blaine added that he wanted to respond to what a member of the public said. We all need to be cognizant of the impacts of this system, not just "global" impacts, but "p-patch" impacts. This isn't just about column location or the guideway. Yes, buildings may need to come down and compromises may need to be made in order to build this system the voters have mandated. He feels there should be a greater level of detail (in these presentations). SMP replied that they were not ignoring the p-patch. (Interbay) is a different scale, which is why the SMP process is different from the Downtown design team's. We are covering those issues.

Action

The Panel thanks Cascade Design Collaborative for the presentation. We compliment the thoroughness of the urban design analysis from a technical standpoint. In the future we would like your presentation to focus on more visual, experiential, and environmental issues important to the site, including:

- **street trees**
- **vegetation**
- **views (both from the Monorail cars and from above the guideway)**
- **pedestrian activity (how they relate to the structure)**
- **site conditions (slope and lighting)**
- **neighborhood character and feel**

We encourage you to develop sections explaining the relationship of the project to the topography, and that you study the bridge over the Magnolia Bridge (including what shade will be generated, the type of switches required, and the implications to the station as well as the maintenance center which will be in the area). We encourage you to be very explicit in showing the impacts on how people live in and use this neighborhood in your next presentation.

We also suggest that SMP provide its urban design teams with a template for the scope and content of their presentations to the MRP, and request that SMP include the maintenance base in its urban design analysis, showing it as thoroughly as it would any other station.

The motion passed with one abstention (moved by Cary and seconded by Nic; Jack abstained).

Don announced that OneReel is putting up two mock columns at Bumbershoot. Suanne Pelley said SMP is working with OneReel on the installation. The column spacing won't be the same as the actual structure (30' to 50' apart because of space limitations before construction begins). SMP is helping them write language to make that clear to the public. The columns will be 57' tall. Also, she just heard from the SMP office and the p-patch meeting (Interbay Gardeners) has been scheduled for August 26 at 1:00.

Additional Panel Discussion with City Staff

- We'll need to see this again. How will it fit into the schedule? *The consultant teams' work is scheduled to wrap at the end of September. A presentation could potentially come after that if we're unable to schedule it earlier.*
- These presentations have been premature. Things have been rushed. *I think it was a judgment call to show you what work has been done already.* It's fine as long as we see it again. I'm willing to meet SMP's timetable, but they haven't done it yet.
- Remember, the next meetings are September 15 and 22.
- We've talked a lot about the process and the schedule, and that's great and legitimate, but at some point we're going to have to plunge into the cold water. That's why I was

pushing a bit earlier; it's time for us to start talking about (the stations). The sooner we begin discussing the stations, the more time they'll have to respond to our recommendations.

- When is Nick (Licata)'s committee making a decision on the Mercer route or cross-Center route? *Tentatively, discussions are set for October, but then Council enters the budget process. The actual decision will be later.*
- I think the point is that we should see something before that.
- Are we scheduled to look at the urban design studies for Ballard and West Seattle? *We will get back to you.*

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.